



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,559	11/13/2001	Lynne M. Coventry	9602.00	6697

26889 7590 07/14/2003

MICHAEL CHAN
NCR CORPORATION
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

ST CYR, DANIEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,559

Applicant(s)

COVENTRY, LYNNE M.

Examiner

Daniel St.Cyr

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 25 and 26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 05 May 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 5/5/03 in which claims 1-8 and 12-20 were canceled, claims 9 and 11 were amended, and claims 21-26 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al, The teachings of Cohen et al have been discussed above.

Cohen et al disclose that a host may be used to authenticate the PIN entry, which indicates

that the system is connected to network but fails to disclose or fairly suggest a plurality of self-service terminals.

However, it is notorious old and well known in the art for ATM network system to involve a plurality of self-service terminals. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time the invention was made to employ a plurality a self-service terminals into the system of Cohen et al in order to provide services in different part of the world, which would make the system more practical and more profitable. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Cohen et al.

4. Claims 9-11 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noyuki, JP Patent No. 361,150,065, in view of Cohen et al. The teachings of Cohen et al have been discussed above.

Naoyuki discloses an automatic teller machine for blind person comprising: a cash dispense 10; a bill validator 11; a slip issuer 12; a card reader 13; a printer 14; a keyboard 15; a display 16; a movable Braille 17, including a vibrating mechanism, for guiding the user; and a voice generator 45 for instructing the user (see the figures 1, 2, 4, and the English abstract).

Naoyuki fails to disclose or fairly suggests a navigation area having tactile guides therefrom for guiding the user.

Cohen et al disclose a method and system for assisting the visually impaired in performing financial transactions comprising: in user interface including a plurality of user interface elements (NEXT, PREVIOUS, SELECT); ; a touch-screen display a navigation area having Braille encoding and physical navigation tactile guides, each tactile guide extending from the navigation area to one of the user interface elements so that a user can locate a user interface, wherein the encoding Braille serves as tactile marker associated with each guide indicating the user interface element to which the tactile guide extends, each movable Braille (41-44) selectively vibrate to guide the user (one at a time) (see figure 1 and col. 3, line 4+).

In view of Cohen et al, it would have been obvious to modify the automated teller machine of Naoyuki to include a navigation area with tactile guides and a touch-screen display to facilitate the users' interactions with the ATM wherein each tactile guide could be integrally designed with the vibration mechanism so each tactile would vibrate to accurately guide the user to a specific interface, such as the machine slot, the touch sensitive zone, etc. Such modification

Art Unit: 2876

would improve the users' ability to interact with the ATM and would expedite each user's transactions. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Naoyuki.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 25 and 26 are allowed.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: although the prior art of record an automated teller machine which includes vibrating components for guiding users to effective interface with interface elements, but the prior art of record fails to disclose or fairly suggest all the details of the components including having a first tactile guide extending between the navigation area and the first opening adjacent to the display, a second tactile guide spaced apart from the first tactile and extending from between the navigation area and a second opening adjacent a non-display device, a first and a second actuatable vibrating device for vibrating the first and the second tactile guide to enable to the users to interact with the display and the non-display device.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. (see examiner remarks).

REMARKS:

8. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, an artisan would have been motivated to modify the teachings Naoyuki to include a navigation area connected to the movable Braille to effectively guide the users to the appropriate interface element.

Such modification would provide a more direct line to the interface elements wherein the users could follow a guide from the navigation location directly to the elements. The applicant arguments are not persuasive. Refer to the rejection above.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel St.Cyr whose telephone number is 703-305-2656. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2876

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7721 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Daniel St.Cyr
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel St. Cyr', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

DS
July 11, 2003